(iii) Tumkur Taluk	...	130
Madhugiri Taluk		37
Gubbi Taluk	...	29
Sira Taluk		26
Turuvekere Taluk	...	24
Tiptur Taluk	...	39
Kunigal Taluk	...	48
Pavagada Taluk		23
Chiknaikanahalli Taluk.	...	17
Koratagere Taluk	...	12
Total	...	385

Departments—

(c) (i) Revenue	..	8 officers
Police	...	2 ,,
Agriculture	...	1 officer
Public Works		7 officers
Registration	...	1 officer
Education	...	1 ,,
Insurance	...	1 ,,

(ii) 29.

(iii) One Revenue Inspector was dismissed ; one Special Revenue Inspector was posted as Clerk and reduced by Rs. 5 ; three Revenue Inspectors, one Amildar and two Fieldmen of the Agricultural Department were warned ; the services of one Agricultural Inspector and one Salesman were terminated, the amount misappropriated by them (the latter two) being ordered to be recovered.

Speaker's Ruling on Point of Order with Respect to Cattle Trespass Bill, 1954

Mr. SPEAKER.—On the 20th instant when the motion for consideration of the Cattle Trespass (Amendment) Bill, 1954 was proposed to be made, some Hon'ble Members objected to the making of the motion on the ground that the Statement of Objects and Reasons accompanying the Bill bore no relation to the Bill as laid on the Table of this House and that thereafter this Bill should not be proceeded with. I stated that I would consider this matter and give a ruling later.

A perusal of the Rules of Procedure indicates that it is only in the case of Bills originating in this House that the Bill is required to be accompanied by a Statement of Objects and Reasons. The Cattle Trespass (Amendment) Bill did not originate in this House. It was introduced in the other House and passed by that House after certain amendments were made in the original Bill. The Bill as passed by the Council was thereafter laid on the Table of this House as required by rule 90-F. This rule merely requires that the Bill as passed by the Council shall be laid on the Table of the House and does not say anything about a Statement of Objects and Reasons. In the several Legislatures in India the practice in this matter appears to differ. In some Legislatures the Bill as passed by the originating chamber together with the Statement of Objects and Reasons is laid on the Table of the other House. This is done though the Bill may have undergone extensive changes in the originating chamber so that the Statement of Objects and Reasons does not correctly indicate the purposes of the Bill as it emerges from the originating House. In certain other Legislatures the Bill as passed by one House is laid on the table of the other without the Statement of Objects and Reasons.

So far as we are concerned in Mysore, the practice has been to lay on the Table of one House the Bill as passed by the other accompanied by the Statement of Objects and Reasons as it was originally appended to the Bill. This was intended to give the members of the House an idea of the purposes underlying the Bill when it was first introduced in the other House. It was felt that to merely lay the Bill unaccompanied by such a Statement would deprive members of such information, whatever it may be worth. However, it is desirable that the Government should always amend the Statement of Objects and Reasons in conformity with the amendments effected by the originating House before taking it up in the other House. I shall also get this question examined again.

It must however be stated that, as a Statement of Objects and Reasons is not part of the Bill, there can be no

(MR. SPEAKER.)

objection to taking up the Bill for consideration. It is quite open to any Hon'ble Member to argue that, as the Bill has been considerably changed, the purpose of the Government in bringing forward this measure would not be achieved by passing the Bill in the present form. That would be an argument on merits which an Hon'ble Member is entitled to pursue. But no objection can be taken for making the motion. If the Hon'ble Minister wants to move that the Bill be taken into consideration, he may do so.

Personal explanation by Member.

Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY (Malur).—Sir, yesterday on a matter of personal explanation, I had requested the Chair to give me an opportunity, when the L. S. G. Minister made personal references to me while speaking on the Appropriation Bill. I request I may kindly be given an opportunity now to explain myself, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

***Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY.**—What I meant was that the amelioration funds are misused and wasted. But the Hon'ble Minister said that I was not sympathetic to the poor and that I did not know the A B C of the locality. He also said that a Member representing a particular constituency should not refer to the affairs of any other constituency in the State. I think both the personal explanation which I am going to give and also the other one that a Member should not refer to the affairs of the Government in another constituency raise a matter of right and privilege of a Member to criticise the Government or to call the Government to order with regard to the utilisation of funds properly. I am in Kolar; I know the locality. Both of us hail from the same area. I should admit that I am not aware of any other activity of the L. S. G. Minister in that locality.

With regard to the other point that I do not know the A. B. C. of the locality and that a Member should not refer to the affairs of Government's activity in another constituency, that raises a fundamental issue and I seek the protection of the Chair and request the Chair to give a ruling with regard to the principle of criticising the actions of the Government in so far as it relates to the utilisation of funds properly for the benefit of the people. I believe and feel that every Member has a right. It is a fundamental right that each Member has with regard to the utilisation of every pie that the *Boregowda* pays to the State Exchequer. I am interested in the welfare of the humble and the poor and I am one of those working for their welfare. My only idea in making that statement was to show that the funds were wasted. In the same family six to eight people have been given sites and in many other families people have not been given one site. I only brought these points to the notice of the L.S.G. Minister so that the matter may be rectified. He never answered my point that the amelioration funds had been wasted. On the other hand he began to hoodwink me and told me that I should not be allowed to speak about his constituency and I do not know the A.B.C. of the locality. These personal remarks may kindly be expunged and a ruling given about the rights of a Member in safeguarding the interests of the people who have elected him and to see that every pie paid by the people to the State coffers is utilised properly. Sir, I leave it to the Members of the House to judge whether I know the A B C of the locality or whether the Hon'ble Minister knows the A.B.C. of the Constitution and the Rules of Procedure.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—You are making some allegation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I regret that occasion should have arisen for me to have to remind the House that no personal recrimination should be made by one Hon'ble Member against another Member of the House. Therefore, if I have allowed any such remarks on the floor of the House, it is a lapse on my part. I might have allowed them inadvertently. There are rules of procedure to be followed by the Hon'ble